

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-34 and 36-37 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 33 has been amended so that it does not depend on a canceled claim.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Interview with Examiner

Applicants wish to again thank the Examiner for the interview held on October 17, 2007. Applicants note that a Statement of Substance of Interview was filed on October 31, 2007 (the Statement is in the PAIR system on the PTO website together with the Remarks section of the October 31, 2007 Amendment), and thus Applicants submit that no further Statement needs to be filed in response to the Interview Summary mailed October 31, 2007 and the Interview Summary mailed December 14, 2007.

Art Rejections

In the Amendment filed October 31, 2007, Applicants noted that with respect to claim 1, the cited references are completely silent concerning the parameters relating to the gas permeability retention, cross-sectional pore laminar coefficient and the specific Young's modulus, and that in this regard, Applicants were considering filing a Rule 132 Declaration to demonstrate that the description "a gas-permeable film ... having numerous open pores" in the Daido et al reference at column 7, lines 33-39, refers to only a film of the structure in which perforated pores are formed and does not include a film of the porous structure according to the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant submits herewith a Rule 132 Declaration executed by Takahiro Daido (the first named inventor in the Daido et al reference) demonstrating that the description "a gas-permeable film ... having numerous open pores" in the Daido et al reference at column 7, lines 33-39, refers to only a film of the structure in which perforated pores are formed and does not include a film of the porous structure according to the present invention.

In particular, Mr. Daido indicates in the Declaration that the description "a gas-permeable film ... having numerous open pores" at column 7, lines 33-39 in Daido et al refers to a film of the structure as schematically shown in Fig. 1 attached to the Declaration in which numerous open pores are formed, and that it does not refer to a film of the structure as schematically shown in Fig. 2 attached to the Declaration in which numerous linked pores are formed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Declaration evidence supports the argument that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Thus, Applicants submit that the present invention is patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT
Application No.: 10/776,184

Attorney Docket No.: Q79839

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 31, 2008